DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 772 UD 028 398

AUTHOR De Board, Roberta J.; And Others
TITLE Bilingual/ESL Mainstream Instructional Support Program. End of Year Evaluation Report for 1989-90. Report No. 90-6.
INSTITUTION Seattle Public Schools, Wash.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 66p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Asian Americans; Attendance; Bilingual Education; Compensatory Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; High Schools; *High School Students; Language Skills; *Limited English Speaking; *Mainstreaming; Minority Groups; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; *School Districts; Spanish Speaking; Study Skills; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Seattle Public Schools WA

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates a program serving high school students in Seattle (Washington) public schools who demonstrate a need for increased language-based academic assistance due to their limited English proficiency. The Mainstream Instructional Support program served 170 students at 2 high schools with 1 resource teacher and 3 instructional assistants. These instructors assisted with completing assignments, developing reading and study skills, counseling, outreach, and translating services. Staff development, materials development, and parent involvement were also important aspects of the program. The evaluation looked at both program implementation and student outcomes. The latter were measured by looking at students' academic success and other indicators of successful progress toward graduation such as attendance rates, grade point averages, and credits toward graduation. The program had no statistically significant effect in raising students' standardized test scores, grades, or attendance rates when compared with like data for students in a similar but unserved comparison group. However, narrative data, administrator and teacher responses, and other indicators suggested that the program had a significant positive impact. Data are presented in four tables. Four appendices present the following: (1) four tables of standardized change score means; (2) the graduation requirements of the Seattle Public Schools and selected study forms; (3) a list of courses attended by program staff; and (4) sample daily log reports completed by staff members. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED338772

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
815 Fourth Avenue North
Seattle, Washington 98109

BILINGUAL/ESL MAINSTREAM INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PROGRAM

End of Year Evaluation Report for 1989-90

REPORT NO. 90-6
NOVEMBER, 1990

ROBERTA J. DE BOARD
MICHAEL DONLIN
MADELAINE RAMEY

William M. Kendrick, Superintendent

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSITIONAL BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Art Kono, Director

AT RISK, MULTICULTURAL SERVICES & SPECIAL PROGRAMS
Collin Williams, Assistant Superintendent

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D.G. Colwell
Seattle Public Schools
Dept. of Res. Planning + Eval.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SERVICES
George Sanders, Manager

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES
Larry Matsuda, Assistant Superintendent

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD028 398

Seattle Public Schools

Department of Transitional Bilingual Education

BILINGUAL/ESL MAINSTREAM INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PROGRAM

End of Year Evaluation Report for 1989-90

Roberta J. De Board

Michael Donlin

Madelaine Ramey

BILINGUAL/ESL MAINSTREAM INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PROGRAM

End of Year Evaluation Report for 1989-90

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

- A. Evaluation of Student Outcomes
- B. Evaluation of Program Process
- C. Evaluation of Program Implementation
- D. Evaluation Limitations

EVALUATION FINDINGS

- A. Student Outcome Evaluation Findings
- B. Program Process Evaluation Findings
- C. Program Implementation

CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS

Seattle Public Schools

Department of Transitional Bilingual Education

BILINGUAL/ESL MAINSTREAM INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PROGRAM

End of Year Evaluation Report for 1989-90

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Seattle School District was awarded a Title VII ESEA Bilingual Grant in September of 1988 to serve high school students who demonstrate a need for increased language-based academic assistance. These students are presently enrolled in English only mainstream academic classes but, due to their limited proficiency in English (and related difficulties), they are struggling to complete the courses required for graduation. The Mainstream Instructional Support Program serves such students at Cleveland and Franklin High Schools. One Resource Teacher and three Instructional Assistants now serve approximately 170 students in their mainstream required classes to complete assignments and develop reading and study skills. These instructors also provide counseling, outreach and translating services. Staff development, materials development and parent involvement have also been important aspects of the program.

The program began in September 1988 with a pre-service component, actual service to students did not commence until February 1989. Due to the shortened period of service (fewer than

180 days) no evaluation was completed nor was an annual report submitted at the end of the 1988-89 school year. However, a status report was submitted as a part of the Continuation grant. The present evaluation report thus covers the entire period of service to date, that is, both the 1988-89 and the 1989-90 school years.

Evaluation of the Mainstream Instructional Support Program is designed to look at both program implementation and student outcomes. The latter are measured by looking at students' academic success and other indicators of successful progress toward graduation such as attendance rates, grade point averages and credits toward graduation.

Conclusions reached in this evaluation are that the program had no statistically significant effect in raising students' standardized test scores, gpa or attendance rates when these are compared with like data for students in a similar but unserved comparison group. Possible reasons for these findings are discussed and recommendations are offered for 1990-91, the program's final year.

INTRODUCTION

In September 1988 the Seattle School District was awarded a three year grant to fund a Title VII ESEA Bilingual Program to serve high school limited-English Proficient (LEP) students who show the greatest need for increased language-based academic assistance. The Mainstream Instructional Support Program serves students who have never before been served by Title VII funds, have had previous schooling commensurate with what might be expected for their ages and are typically non-English or limited-English speakers. Students within the program typically are enrolled in mainstream English-only classes for four or five periods per day and receive one English as a Second Language class and some native language tutoring two or three times a week. They have continued to score below the 35th percentile on standardized achievement tests and have shown difficulty with or inability to successfully complete the mainstream courses required for graduation.

Both Cleveland and Franklin High Schools have served as centers for the Mainstream Instructional Support Program. During the initial year (1988-89) approximately 100 students were identified as eligible for service with 92 of them actually served. During the current (1989-90) year approximately 223 students were eligible for service; 177 were served by the program. Approximately 20 language groups are represented among the populations of the two schools. The largest language groups are made up of students who speak Vietnamese, Lao (including Hmong, Mien and Khumu), Tagalog and Ilocano, and Chinese (Cantonese, Mandarin, Toisanese and Taiwanese). The Spanish and Vietnamese-

speaking groups are growing most rapidly. Students who speak other languages are also served depending on the enrollment at each site.

One Resource Teacher and three Instructional Assistants provide direct service to students in their mainstream required classes with a focus on the reading and study skills needed to succeed. These insructors work in coordination with the regular building mainstream and bilingual staffs. In addition, they offer counseling and other services to both individuals and small groups of students. Staff meet frequently with students to monitor both academic progress toward graduation and any problems students may have which keep them from attending school. The impact of the Resource Teacher and Instructional Assistants reaches far beyond the classroom as they are used for outreach and retrieval, translating and helping to resolve minor crises.

Staff development has been coordinated with other Title VII projects and the District's office of staff development and has included both pre- and in-service courses. These have been made available to all staff with credit possible from Seattle Pacific University.

Parent involvement has been encouraged by letters, phone contacts and the establishment of a phone tree to announce meetings. Monthly parent meetings are scheduled and efforts made to encourage attendance. Materials development has generally focused on curriculum units to teach test-taking skills.

EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Two evaluation designs will be combined to evaluate the effect of the program to date. The first, a student outcome evaluation, attempts to answer the question:

> Have students shown improved academic success as a result of their participation in the program?

It uses student achievement scores and grade point averages as indicators of academic success and an intact control group, similar to the experimental group, to provide a standard of comparison. The second design, a process evaluation, takes a close look at how the program was implemented and actually functioned in the schools and with the targeted populations. It addresses the "process" questions:

> Was the program successfully implemented in the two target schools? and
>
> Did students receive appropriate and useful support which helped them remain in school and make adequate progress towards graduation?

This evaluation is based on written documentation of the program, interviews with the Program Manager and narratives from the Resource Teacher and Instructional Assistants. It is intended to provide background information that may be helpful in understanding the student outcomes and also offers information on the many other factors which, although not measured in quantifiable terms, may have been important factors in the success of the program.

A. Evaluation of Student Outcomes

The student outcome question was cast more specifically in terms of program objectives. Objectives one through four deal with student outcomes and are measured by analysis of California Achievement Test results and students' grade point averages. These objectives were revised from their original versions (submitted with the original grant proposal in 1985) into more readable and measurable form. These revised objectives are as follow:

Objective 1.0
Students enrolled in the program and receiving instruction for 180 days will make reading gains as measured by the Total Reading scores of the California Achievement Test (CAT), that are significantly greater than the gains made by non-program LEP students.

Objective 2.0
Students enrolled in the program and receiving instruction for 180 days will make language proficiency gains, as measured by the Total Language scores of the California Achievement Test (CAT), that are significantly greater than the gains made by nonprogram LEP students.

Objective 3.0
Students enrolled in the program and receiving instruction for 180 days will make oral language gains as measured by the Language Expression scores of the California Achievement Test (CAT) that are greater, to a statistically significant degree, than gains made by nonprogram LEP students.

Objective 4.0
Students enrolled in the program and receiving instruction for 180 days will make academic achievement gains, as measured by their overall GPA, which are significantly greater than the gains of nonprogram LEP students.

Objectives five through seven deal with students' adaptation to the school setting and their progress toward graduation. In their revised forms they were stated as follows:

Objective 5.0
90% of students enrolled in program for 180 days will score 60% or more correct on a test of cultural awareness.

Objective 6.0
All students in the program will develop an educational plan which incorporates all courses needed for graduation.

Objective 7.0
Students enrolled in the program will show an improvement in their attendance rates which is greater, to a statistically significant degree, than improvement shown by nonprogram students.

Data for the evaluation of student outcomes includes students' California Achievement Test scores, educational plans and attendance rates. The present evaluation covers 3 administrations of the California Achievement Test beginning with Spring 1988 and ending with Spring 1990. For students who were served by the program in the last semester of 1988-89 only, scores from the 1988 and 1989 administrations were compared. For those students who were served in the last semester of 1988-89 and in one or both semesters of 1989-90, the 1988 and 1990 administrations were compared. Finally, for those students who participated only during the 1990-91 school year(either or both semesters), comparison of the 1989 and 1990 administrations was made. Table I shows this graphically.

Table I
Comparison of CAT scores
according to dates of participation

1988 CAT		1989 CAT		1990 CAT
1988-89 1st sem	1988-89 2nd sem	1989-90 1st sem	1989-90 2nd sem	
	x			compare 88-89 score
x		x		compare 88-90 scores
x		x	x	
x			x	
		x		compare 89-90 scores
		x	x	
			x	

Attendance rates were compared in a similar way by comparing differences between the number the number of days absent for the quarter preceeding a student's initial participation in the program and the number of days absent in that student's final quarter in the program.

B. Evaluation of Program Process

The process questions were also cast (partially) in terms of program objectives. Objectives eight and nine deal with staff hiring and development and are measured by compliance with district guidelines and participation of program staff in on-going training opportunities.

> Objective 8.0
> To hire, train, and supervise a differentiated staff, establishing success in this task by personnel evaluation procedures for the District, for [evaluation of] the Director, and the Instructional Assistants.

> Objective 9.0
> To implement a preservice training period with university support and credit, establishing success in this through successful completion of coursework by appropriate program staff.

Objective 10 deals with the instructional services provided and the development and use of instructional materials.

> Objective 10.0
> To employ special teaching strategies and techniques, establishing success in this task by the coursework and concurrent practices during the preservice and inservice periods.

C. Evaluation of Program Implementation

In order to fully answer the process questions of whether the program was successfully implemented and helped students make progress toward graduation, one must look further than statistical

analyses or student's grades. Beginning a new program in schools with already existing hierarchies, roles, styles and political dynamics requires both skill and finesse in interpersonal relations. To implement a program that crosses many cultural boundaries while integrating itself both into the schools' and the district's structures is a true challenge. The Mainstream Support Program's success in this area is documented by reports, narratives and daily logs of service delivery. Parent involvement is described and exemplary practices which go beyond the scope of the original grant are detailed.

D. Evaluation Limitations

As with any evaluation there are limitations to this end-of-year review. Statistical analyses could only be performed on data that is routinely collected by the school district. By state guidelines students are exited from bilingual services when they score at or above the 35th percentile in both reading and language on the California Achievement Test. Thus, the CAT is the only standardized achievement test which is administered to all students even though its use for bilingual students is questionable in several respects. Normed on a monolingual English-speaking population, the CAT is a dubious measure of a bilingual student's ability to survive and succeed in mainstream classes. Furthermore, because the CAT is administered only once yearly, some students did not complete the test on one or another year. Pre- to post-analyses could only be completed on those students who had available scores rather than on all students who had participated

in the program. And because the experimental group needed to be defined early in each semester, students who were picked up for service later in the semester were also not included in the analyses. Further, for those students who were not in the program during the second semester of a school year, there was a lag time between the time they ended the program and the time they were tested.

Attendance data are reported in terms of the average number of days absent as obtained from the same central computer system used to produce report cards. The average number of days absent was computed from grade marking files each semester. Absences are reported on a period by period basis. To calculate the number of days absent, the total sum of all absences by periods was calculated and then divided by the number of periods for which the student was enrolled. Obviously, the accuracy of data analysis is dependant on the accuracy of the data reported; recording of attendance at the building level is notoriously poor.

The design of the program itself led to two further statistical limitations. Because of the way in which Bilingual Centers are located within the school system, students could not be randomly assigned to program or comparison schools. (Assignment to schools is made on the basis of student's address, racial and ethnic balance within the schools, a student's previous educational history, the availability of native language support and the availability of space within buildings.) Comparison students were selected from among bilingual students at Roosevelt and Hale high schools. While all four schools have similar populations and

similar bilingual services are provided by the ESL teachers, the comparison schools do not have the additional resource teacher and Instructional Assistants so that additional native language support in mainstream classes may not be as readily available. Because students were not randomly assigned to schools, any differences seen between treatment and comparison groups might be due to bias in selection rather than due to the effect of the "treatment" (in this case, what MIS Program teachers and IAs do). To control for this, the statistical analysis compared standardized change scores as recommended by Kenny (1975) as a means to appropriately measure treatment effects even though the experimental and comparison groups were not equivalent. Students' scale scores were standardized (to have 0 mean and unit variance) for both pre- and post-test. A student's standardized change score, then, is the difference between his/her standardized pretest and posttest scores. (Raw change scores are inappropriate for analysis for several reasons.) While it would have been statistically ideal to attempt to match program and comparison students on such variables as sex, grade level, bilingual status (length of time in school in the U.S.), immigration status (refugee vs. non-refugee), person(s) student is living with, and free or reduced lunch eligigility., the numbers of similar students enrolled in the comparison schoools were so small that such matching was not possible; all students enrolled in the bilingual programs at both Roosevelt and Nathan Hale High Schools were included in the comparison group.

Althcugh the program was funded for the 1988-89 school year, actual interaction with students did not begin until the second

semester of 1989. During the summer after this initial period the MIS, together with the District's other Title VII project, offered a summer school opportunity to students who were interested and wished to gain additional credits. It was well attended and all students earned credits toward graduation. However, participation in the summer school classes could not be included in the statistical analyses for several reasons. Progress toward graduation was analyzed by semesters and enrollment in one summer school course could not be considered equivalent to a semester's worth of work. Because the summer school program was made available to all bilingual students in the district, students from the comparison group might have been enrolled but the data collection did not allow for a way to check on such possible contamination. Therefore, although the summer school courses were an important part of the program, students' participation was not included in the statistical analysis.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

Outcome evaluation findings which relate to students' academic achievement are presented first in this section. They are followed by the process evaluation findings and the evaluation of how

successfully the program has been implemented.

A. Student Outcome Evaluation Findings

Evaluation to determine attainment of objectives one through seven, collectively, serves to answer the student outcome question:

> Have students shown improved academic success as a result of their participation in the program?

The first subsidiary question (Objective 1.0), asks if students enrolled in the program and receiving instruction for 180 days have made reading gains as measured by the Total Reading scors on the California Achievement Test (CAT), that are significantly greater than the gains made by non-program LEP students? It must be answered in the negative.

The second outcome question (Objective 2.0) asks if students enrolled in the program and receiving instruction for 180 days have made language proficiency gains, as measured by the Total Language scores of the California Achievement Test (CAT), that are significantly greater than the gains made by nonprogram LEP students; it must also be answered in the negative.

Likewise, the third outcome question (Objective 3.0) which asks if students enrolled in the program and receiving instruction for 180 days have made oral language gains as measured by the Language Expression subtest of the California Achievement Test (CAT) that are greater, to a statistically significant degree, than gains made by nonprogram LEP students has a negative response.

The final outcome question (Objective 4.0) asks if students enrolled in the program and receiving instruction for 180 days have made academic achievement gains, as measured by their overall GPA,

which are significantly greater than the gains of nonprogram LEP students; it also has a negative response.

Success on these objectives was measured by analyses comparing pre-program to end of year California Achievement Test scores with those of students in a comparison group. Results of such analyses are shown in Tables 2A, 2B and 2C which are found in Appendix A. These tables reflect results of significance tests applied to standardized change scores. In no case did the analyses indicate a statistically significant ($p>.05$) effect for the treatment (Mainstream Instructional Support) group.

Objectives five through seven deal with students' adaptation to the school setting and their progress toward graduation. Objective five anticipated that 90% of the students in the program would successfully pass a test of cultural awareness. To date no such test has been administered to program student. Preliminary discussions regarding the development of such a test have taken place between the Project Director and the Office of Staff Development. As the Resource Teacher and the Instructional Assistants implement the methodology of co-operative learning with students, they are learning to work together across cultural boundaries and are learning to be more empathetic of each others' differences. Program staff have also increased their own cultural awareness as they work with students from so many varied backgrounds.

Objective six anticipates that all students in the program would develop an educational plan incorporating all courses needed for graduation. Forms for such planning were promptly developed

and implemented (see Appendix B for samples). As students begin the program, they work individually with the Resource Teacher or one of the Instructional Assistants to fill out the form, anticipating both the courses they will need and the time line for completing them. Ideally, these are then reviewed with each student at the end of each semester before they register for upcoming classes.

The final stated objective, that attendance rates for program participants would improve significantly more than rates for comparison students was not successfully met. Again, because of the unequal size of the groups, these data were standardized for purposes of analysis. Data were analyzed and are presented in Table 2D of Appendix A as the number of days absent, the inverse of improved attendance.

Although not formally stated as an objective, the implicit goal of the program is to help students successfully progress toward graduation. Afurther measure of such progress is the number of graduation credits earned. A comarison of such credits earned by Mainstream Instructional Support and comparison group students is also detailed in Tables 2A, 2B and 2C; the differences between groups were not statistically significant.

B. Program Process Evaluation Findings

Evaluation to determine attainment of objectives eight through ten serves to answer the process questions:

> Was the program successfully implemented in the two target schools? and
>
> Did students receive appropriate and useful support which helped them remain in school and make adequate progress towards graduation?

The first sibsidiary question (Objective 8.0) asks if differentiated staff were hired, trained and supervised with successful evaluations according to the appropriate District procedures. Staff was originally hired by October 21, 1988 as follow:

name	position	ethnicity	languages
Michael Donlin	Program Director	White	Palauan
Hung Pham	Resource Teacher	Vietnamese	Vietnamese
Laurena Divina	Inst. Asst.	Filipina	Tagalog/Ilocano
Tai Ngo	Inst. Asst.	Chinese	Chinese/Vietnamese
KhamOui Sikhanthat	Inst. Asst.	Laotian	Lao
Annie Tat	Secretary	Vietnamese	Vietnamese/Chinese

Instructional Assistants were selected partly on the basis of their language abilities in order to serve the largest concentrations of students in the program in which approximately 20 different languages are represented. During the course of the first two years of service one of the Instructional Assistants became certified and took another teaching position; she was replaced by another Tagalog/Ilocano speaking I. A. The secretarial position also was eliminated at the end of the first year due to Title VII funding reduction; secretarial duties were assumed by the Department of Transitional Bilingual Education secretary.

Supervision of all staff has taken place on a yearly basis with positive evaluations in all cases. (More detailed information is not available as personnel evaluations are confidential according to the bargained agreement between the District and the employee unions.) The Program Director is evaluated by the Director of Transitional Bilingual Education; the Resource Teacher is evaluated by the building principals in collaboration with the Program Director; and the Instructional Assistants are evaluated

by the building principals with input from both the Resource Teacher and the Program Director.

Training in managing the day-to-day affairs of such a program was provided by the Program Director as the program staff began to make contacts with building staff and eligible students. Such "training" is better described as on-going as the Program Director continues to be involved in overseeing and co-ordinating the services provided in each building. Just as the Program Director works closely with the Resource Teacher to plan services and resolve dilemmas, the Resource Teacher plans with and oversees the Instructional Assistants.

The second subsidiary question (Objective 9.0) asks if pre-service training was accomplished by the successful offering and completion of university coursework and if second year inservice activities have also successfully taken place. Both preservice and inservice offerings have been coordinated with two other Title VII programs in the District. Pre-service courses were selected from among the offerings at two local universities in order to best meet the needs of program staff as they began to serve students. Courses which were attended by all program staff are listed in Table 3 found in Appendix C. In addition, during the preservice period two District-wide seminars were presented which were jointly funded by Title VII projects and the Professional Development Office:

Teaching in a Multiethnic and Pluralistic School System	Dr. Edwin Nichols	12/09/88
A Nation in Crisis: The Dropout Dilemma	Byron Kunisawa	01/20/89

Other in-service offerings which are made available by the District have also been attended by the Program staff. It is gratifying to note that one Instructional Assistant was able to use the training provided to help obtain her teaching certification and move into a teaching position with the District.

C. Program Implementation

In order to know the extent to which a program is effective one must first know how and to what extent the program has actually been implemented. As Patton (1987) states, "Unless one knows that a program is operating according to design, there may be little reason to expect it to provide the desired outcomes." Review of teacher's and instructional assistants' reports, narratives and daily logs as well as interviews with the Program Director served as the basis for this evaluation of the actual program implementation.

Original grant applications anticipated that approximately 265 students would be eligible for service in the two schools, to include a large number of students from the Bilingual Orientation Center. In reality, by the time the project was funded and intitiated, changes in the District's service patterns meant that fewer eligible students were actually placed in these schools. But even so, the need to juggle the schedules of the students, the courses in which they needed assistance and the teachers' need to travel between schools all imposed limits on the number of students who could be served. Table 4 shows the numbers of students who were eligible for service each semester in each school and the numbers of students who were actually served.

Table 4

Mainstream Instructional Support Program
Eligible and Served Students in Cleveland and Franklin High Schools
by semester

	last sem 88-89	first sem 89-90	last sem 89-90
Eligible	Cleveland: 52 Franklin: 45	Cleveland: 84 Franklin: 77	Cleveland: 118 Franklin: 105
Served (including mainstream)	Cleveland: 66 Franklin: 56	Cleveland: 44 Franklin: 45	Cleveland: 89 Franklin: 88

Other changes in both the District and the Office of Transitional Bilingual Education's policies influenced the implementation of the program. With the 1989-90 school year the Seattle School District implemented a new plan of controlled choice for assignment of students to school buildings in order to achieve racial equity and integration within all school buildings. This major district-wide effort resulted in the re-location of many students and teachers and the disruption of many relationships and programs. While the MIS student distribution was not impacted directly by movement of many students, many of the working relationships with mainstream teachers needed to be re-established and revised as their student populations changed.

At the time the grant proposal was written the Department of Transitional Bilingual Education was organized by having some schools designated as having Bilingual Centers; these schools had an increased number of bilingual staff and were assigned a concentration of students who were two or more years behind in their schooling. Other "Regular Center" schools, with fewer students assigned, provided only ESL instructions for the students

who were, for the most part, at grade level in their previous schooling. Under this configuration the grant was written to provide additional service to students in non-center schools. However, by the time of implementation, the Department of Transitional Bilingual Education had, due to other forces involved in setting District integration policy, done away with the distinction between Newcomer Center and regular Bilingual Center schools. Students are no longer assigned according to previous schooling; all school have both students who have and have not attended school without interruption in the past. This change impacted the MIS program objectives as there are now students included who may or may not have had grade-commensurate schooling before enrolling here. While the change in policy impacted both program and comparison schools, it is not known if the degree of impact was comparable. This variation from program design may account for the failure to see statistical differences between project and commparison groups but such cannot be confirmed.

The program was implemented according to the proposal in regards to placing students in mainstream classes with their same-aged peers. With the help of the Resource Teacher and the Instructional Assistants, students were guided to plan the coursework needed for graduation and to register for required courses. In addition, a few English-speaking American students have been served by the program in each school; their inclusion was aimed at fostering better understanding between Limited English Speaking and mainstream students. By having the Instructional Assistants serve students in their mainstream classes, regular

education teeachers of those classes have also gained a better understanding of LEP students and show more empathy for their struggles to learn English at the same time that they work on course content.

Objective 10 indicates that the program staff would learn and employ special teaching strategies with success to be measured by coursework and concurrent practices during the preservice and inservice. In this regard, the degree of program implementation is difficult to evaluate. All program staff completed coursework which focused on teaching and intervention practices. However, actual implementation of such skills was dependent on many factors. Of course, the teacher's familiarity and comfort in using the teaching techniques varied but also the opportunities to try out such techniques varied from school to school and from mainstream teacher to teacher. As the Resource Teacher and IAs worked with different mainsteam teachers, it was most often necessary to follow their lead and adapt their teaching materials and format. When small groups of students were pulled out for more individualized instruction, staff was able to implement specialized teaching strategies; this was monitored informally by the Program Director and discussed at staff meetings. (The Instructional Assistant who became certificated now uses these strategies in her classroom.)

Both development of new materials and adaptation of textbooks and other materials have been helpful in providing services to students. As mainstream teachers assign materials, the Instructional Assistants work to adapt them to the levels of their students so that they are comprehensible and meaningful. Staff

members have also developed materials for training students to be more successful in taking standardized achievement tests. These materials have been utilized with some students but were not implemented in a consistent fashion. Study skills were also incorporated into the program in an informal fashion which was difficult to assess. Again, teaching of such skills was on-going as the Instruction Assistants worked with students to keep notebooks in order, preview new materials, review for tests, etc.

Overall, the process evaluation findings provide positive answers to the questions posed regarding successful implementation and provision of adequate support to help students remain in school and make adequate progress. Although statistical reporting may obfuscate the positive gains of these students, narratives attest to the kind of outreach and support given by the program staff. Such narratives (see Appendix D) detail, in a qualitative way, the many kinds of outreach and support that were given to students to keep them in school.

CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS

Establishing a program such as the Mainstream Instructional Support Program has meant overcoming many obstacles at District, building and personal levels yet the program has successfully provided additional support services to an average of 129 students from nearly 20 different language backgrounds in two different buildings. Changes in District policy regarding how students are assigned to schools meant that the program served a slightly

different population than had been originally anticipated. Some of the students had not had grade-equivalent schooling, thus greatly complicating the task of helping them progress toward graduation. Also, changes in District policy meant changes in the numbers of bilingual students assigned to the program schools; with changing numbers of students each semester, program staff was challenged to try to provide service to all eligible students. Another problem at the building level was the difficulty of meshing service provision with the schedules of both teachers and students. In several cases, students who were eligible and in need of service could not be served because they were scheduled to take required courses at times when neither Instructional Assistants nor the Resource Teacher could be in those mainstream classroom to assist them. At a more personal level there was a broad continuum of kinds of service provided to students ranging from offering a supportive word of encouragement to intensive out-reach to retrieve students who had dropped out of school. The level of service provided was decided subjectively according to the needs of the student and the capacity of the staff to meet these needs. As in any counseling situation, it was important for staff to build and maintain such relationships with students both to provide on-going support as well as to be knowledgable of the students and known to them in case of a crisis. While interview and narrative reports strongly support that this type of flexible service provision was appropriate and successful in meeting the needs of students, such a broad range of services was difficult to measure statistically. Other concerns related to the small number of subjects in groups,

testing on only an annual basis and the high turn-over rate of students actually being served made it difficult to capture, statistically, what was happening with the program.

While outcome assessments, based on the statistical analyses showed no significant differences between program and comparison group outcomes, the process evaluation indicates that the program was successfully implemented and has had a positive impact in the schools. Principals have expressed not only their satidfaction with the program but also their wish for more such service. Mainstream teachers have also spontaneously praised the work of the Resource Teacher and the Instructional Assistants.

Recommendations for the final year of the project are aimed at both the delivery of service in the schools and the evaluation process itself. While mainstream teachers are generally supportive of the program, welcome the Instructional Assistants into their classes and have become more empathetic to the LEP students, during the final year more emphasis needs to be given to helping mainstream teachers understand the cultural and linguistic differences of bilingual students. Teaching such cultural awareness will also help students achieve the goal stated in Objective 5.0 relating to passing a test of cultural knowledge. Evaluation of student gains needs to look not only at the immediate effects of the program but also at the sustained gains of students as they continue in school. This will also allow for a more longitudinal look to measure whether students who have been in the program over a longer period of time are making greater gains than those who are served only briefly.

Better documentation and a more thorough evaluation look may well bring the statistical picture into keeping with the process picture of a program which is successfully assisting LEP high-school students to complete school.

REFERENCES

Kenny, David. (1975). A Quasi-experimental approach to assessing treatment effects in the non-equivalent control group design. Psychological Bulletin, 82, 345-362.

Patton, Michael. (1987). How to use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation. Newbury Park, CA. Sage Publications.

Appendix A

Table 2A
Standardized Change Score Means for
Mainstream Instructional Support and Comparison Groups
first year only - Spring 1988 to Spring 1989 CAT administrations

Mainstream Instrucional Support				Comparison Group			
Subtest	N	Mean Standardized Change Score	Standard Deviation	Subtest	N	Mean Standardized Change Score	Standard
Reading Comprehension	16	-.29	.67	Reading Comprehension	68	.07	.64
Total Reading	16	-.05	.51	Total Reading	68	.01	.46
Language Expression	16	.22	.65	Language Expression	69	-.05	.73
Total Language	16	.21	.60	Total Language	69	-.05	.57
Cumulative Grade Point	36	-.04	.17	Cumulative Grade Point	88	.02	.23
Credits toward Graduation	36	-.04	.13	Credits toward Graduation	88	.01	.27

Note: none of the t-tests performed on the above data yielded statistically significant ($p < .05$) results in the appropriate direction.

Table 2B
Standardized Change Score Means for
Mainstream Instructional Support and Comparison Groups
second year only - Spring 1989 to Spring 1990 CAT administrations

Mainstream Instrucional Support				Comparison Group			
Subtest	N	Mean Standardized Change Score	Standard Deviation	Subtest	N	Mean Standardized Change Score	Standard Deviation
Reading Comprehension	37	.10	1.04	Reading Comprehension	118	-.03	.63
Total Reading	35	-.03	.56	Total Reading	117	.01	.42
Language Expression	37	.07	.77	Language Expression	119	-.02	.63
Total Language	36	-.03	.70	Total Language	118	.01	.52
Cumulative Grade Point	53	-.03	.29	Cumulative Grade Point	190	.01	.27
Credits toward Graduation	53	.0002	.26	Credits toward Graduation	190	.0001	.36

Note: none of the t-tests performed on the above data yielded statistically significant ($p < .05$) results in the appropriate direction.

Table 2C
Standardized Change Score Means for
Mainstream Instructional Support and Comparison Groups
first and second years - Spring 1988 to Spring 1990 CAT administrations

Mainstream Instrucional Support				Comparison Group			
Subtest	N	Mean Standardized Change Score	Standard Deviation	Subtest	N	Mean Standardized Change Score	Standard Deviation
Reading Comprehension	18	-.04	1.11	Reading Comprehension	46	.02	.83
Total Reading	18	-.00	.85	Total Reading	46	.00	.58
Language Expression	19	.20	1.12	Language Expression	46	-.08	.62
Total Language	19	.12	.95	Total Language	46	-.05	.55
Cumulative Grade Point	38	-.21	.48	Cumulative Grade Point	71	.11	.62*
Credits toward Graduation	38	-.17	.55	Credits toward Graduation	71	.09	.54*

Note: T-tests performed on the above data yielded statistically significant ($p < .05$) results but in the wrong direction.

Table 2D
Standardized Change Score Means for
Mainstream Instructional Support and Comparison Groups

Mainstream Instructional Support			Comparison Group		
N	Mean Standardized Change Score	Standard Deviation	N	Mean Standardized Change Score	Standard Deviation
students present 1988-89 only					
36	.25	.89	88	-.10	.69
students present 1989-90 only					
53	.27	1.29	190	-.08	.79*
students present 1988-89 and 1989-90					
38	.001	1.63	71	-.001	.66

Note: T-tests performed on these data yielded results which were statistically significant ($p<.05$) but in the wrong direction.

Appendix B

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS 1988-89

LANGUAGE ARTS	NUMBER OF CLASSES	CREDITS
Language Arts 9A	1	.50
Language Arts 9B	1	.50
Language Arts 10A	1	.50
Language Arts 11A	1	.50
Electives	2	1.00
SOCIAL STUDIES		
World History 1	1	.50
World History 11	1	.50
World History 111	1	.50
U.S. History 11A	1	.50
U.S. History 11B	1	.50
American Gov't & Economics	1	.50
MATHEMATICS	4	2.00
SCIENCE	4	2.00
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	4	2.00
HEALTH	1	.50
OCCUPATION EDUCATION	3	1.50
Home Economics Business Education Industrial Arts		
UNSPECIFIED ELECTIVES	12	6.00
Total Credits needed for GRADUATION		20.00

HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM PLANNING WORKSHEET

* * * * Class of 19 * * * *

(Student's Name)

SPECIFIED COURSES

5 Credits
(25% of Credits for Graduation)

Grade 9

Language Arts 9A
Language Arts 9B
World History I
World History II

Grade 10

Language Arts 10A
World History III

Grade 11

Language Arts 11A
U.S. History 11A
U.S. History 11B

Grade 12

American Government and Economics

* * * *

COURSE CHOICE WITHIN SPECIFIED SUBJECT AREAS

9 Credits
(45% of Credits for Graduation)

English Language Arts - 1.0 Credits

(Course) (Date)
(Course) (Date)

Mathematics - 2.0 Credits

(Course) (Date)
(Course) (Date)
(Course) (Date)
(Course) (Date)

Science - 2.0 Credits

(Course) (Date)
(Course) (Date)
(Course) (Date)
(Course) (Date)

Occupational Ed - 1.5 Credits

(Course) (Date)
(Course) (Date)
(Course) (Date)

Physical Ed - 2.0 Credits

(Date) (Date)
(Date) (Date)

Health - .5 Credits

ELECTIVES

6 Credits
(30% of Credits for Graduation)

Art
Foreign Language
Music
and/or elective courses from all other subject areas

Course:	Credit:	Date:

TITLE VII - STUDENT RECORD SHEET

NAME: _____ _____

ADDRESS: _____

_____

PHONE: _____

LIVES WITH: _____

EMERGENCY CONTACT: _____

PHONE: _____

BIRTHDATE: _____

PRESENT AGE: _____

INITIAL CONTACT:
DATE: _____

NOTES:

DISTRICT ENTRY DATE: _____

YEARS IN PROGRAM: _____

PRESENT SCHOOL: _____

	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
GRADE:						
GRADUATION CREDITS:						
GPA:						
LAS:						
CAT: RDG.						
COMP:						
T.RDG.:						
T.LNG.:						

TITLE VII STUDENT RECORD/SCHEDULES

NAME: _____ SCHOOL: _____ GRADE: _____

FALL/SPRING 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95

PERIOD:	CLASS:	TEACHER:	R/RE/E	GRADE:	CREDIT:	SERVICE:
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						

FALL/SPRING 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95

PERIOD:	CLASS:	TEACHER	R/RE/E	GRADE:	CREDIT:	SERVICE:
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						

COMMENTS:

Seattle Public Schools
Transitional Bilingual Education
TITLE VII

Resource Center - Contacts/Referrals

Date	Type of Contact/Referral	Remarks/Comments

FORM.5

Seattle Public Schools
Transitional Bilingual Education
TITLE VII Project

Resource Center - Staff Contact Form

Staff Member	Subject/Contact	Period	Type of Assistance

FORM.4

Seattle Public Schools
Transitional Bilingual Education
TITLE VII Project

Resource Center - Student Progress Report

SCALE: 1=Satisfactory
2=Showing Improvement
3=Needs Improvement

Name: _____

Areas of Concern

Date	Attendance	Attitude	Class Participation	Assignments	Test Scores	Subject	Remarks/Comments

FORM.7

Seattle Public Schools
Transitional Bilingual Education
TITLE VII Project

Assignment Record

Teacher: _____ Subject: _____ Period: _____

Day/Date	Assignment	Day/Date	Grade

FORM.3

Appendix C

Table 3A
Preservice and Inservice Courses attended by all
Mainstream Instructional Support Program staff
1988-89 School Year

Title	Instructor	Dates	Credit
Development of ESL Literacy	L. Quist	10/24-11/21/88	yes
Teaching ESL: Theory and Application	S. Baldwin	10/25-11/22/88	yes
ESL in the Content Areas	N. Butler	11/23-12/22/88	yes
Positive Classroom Management	M. Pitts	11/28-12/19/88	yes
Teaching in a Pluralistic and Multiethnic School System	E. Nichols	12/09/88	no
Learning Styles/ Strategies for At-Risk Students	P. Guild	01/09=02/01/89	yes
Intro. to Cooperative Learning	J. Mezich	01/28/89	yes
Advanced Cooperative Learning	J. Mezich	03/18/89	yes
High School Dropouts	D. Caple	04/08-05/24/89	yes
TBE/Special Ed. Conference	?	04/24-04/25/89	no
Washington Assn. Bilingual Ed. Conf.		04/14-04/15-89	no

Table 3B
Inservice Courses attended by one or more
Mainstream Instructional Support Program staff
1989-90 School Year

Classroom English Improvement for ESL Educators	N. Butler-Tulare	9/12-11/7/89	yes
Intro to Cooperative Learning	Interface Staff	9/14-9/16/89 9/28-9/30/89 10/19-10/21/89	yes
Cooperative Learning in Content Areas: LA/Soc Studies	Interface Staff	11/16-11/18/89	yes
Cooperative Learning in Content Areas: Math/Science	Interface Staff	11/30-12/1/89	yes
IA/Tutor Inservice	Interface Staff	10/20/89	no
Whole Language Reading	N. Johnson	1/9-1/13/90	yes

Appendix D

NAME: HUNG PHAM

FROM: 10/2 TO 10/6

TITLE VII MAINSTREAM SUPPORT
BI-MONTHLY DAILY-LOG REPORT.

MONDAY DATE: 10/2/89	TUESDAY DATE: 10/3/89	WEDNESDAY DATE: 10/4/89	THURSDAY DATE: 10/5/89	FRIDAY DATE: 10/6/89
Franklin: A.M I was request by Baldwin V.P to look for transfer a Laotian student who has not shown up in his W.H I class for a couple days. It turned out that he skipped because the class was difficult to him. Again, I had to work back and forth between classes and the counseling office to negotiate for a change in his schedule. Cleveland: P.M To coordinate the interview for the Ingalog Identify I.A position together with Dr. Ingalina and Baldwin.	Cleveland: All day Observed and discussed in Azares's class to see if we can move some of the bilingual student who had been misassigned into regular classed into bilingual classes 12:00 - 12:45 Helped NGHIA TRAN to finish his science project in chemistry I. and to complete his assignment in American Government. Both were due the following day	Franklin: All day. 7:50 - 8:30 Finally get the whole of vaughan Manerah, a Laotian student who had been skipped from his 2nd Period, Integ. Math IIA because of its difficulty. In the end I was able to transfer him into the correct class with Lacey (Integ Math I) same period 8:45 - 9:35. worked in Belmonte's W.H I & US IIA to help 6 VN students to complete their assignments 10:00 - 11:45 Helped Lacey in his Re. Integ Math 1:15 - 2:15. worked in Jaworlouski to tutor 5 Vietnamese in various assignment.	Cleveland: All day worked in MO to look for potential dropout problem and Informed parents of those who have more than 5 absences	Franklin A.M Tutoring in Part 6 in Social Studies for Belmonte Counseled eight Hmongs a new students on to what classes should she take and developed a 4 year plan for her Cleveland P.M Helped Phung Truong with her social studies assignment in the office. I Also check for students' absence

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NAME: HUNG PHAM

FROM: 10/9 TO 10/13

TITLE VII MAINSTREAM SUPPORT
BI-MONTHLY DAILY-LOG REPORT.

MONDAY DATE: 10/9/89	TUESDAY DATE: 10/10/89	WEDNESDAY DATE: 10/11/89	THURSDAY DATE: 10/12/89	FRIDAY DATE: 10/13/89
Franklin : All day I was called to H/O to talk to Baldoria (V.P) about Joseph Muliga, a Samoan students who has been absenced for more than 12 days to see if we can put him back in the classroom. After several hours of searching, I finally get him at the building. We went to the office, had a long discussion both with student and 2 teachers involved, gave Joseph more verbal and had him regard our attendance contract. He seemed to be very regrettable and promised to be regular in attendance. Passed out attendance slips for him to turn in by end of the day as proofs.	Franklin - 8 - 11:45 I went back to Franklin to meet Suzanne, a Cham I.A to discuss way to maximize her time and better serve 3 Cham students at Franklin. Coming thru those 3 students schedule, we were able to come up with a good schedule in which Suzanne not only can serve them in S.S, L.A math but also help 5 other Vietnamese as well since she can speak vietnamese fluently. Cleveland : 12:15 - 2:45 Seeing the problems that most of our students faced after leaving the B.D. I went to Andy's S.S class and suggested to give him some materials that I had used before to help him out with his lack of related ones	Franklin - All day Joseph Muliga seemed to be doing all right. For 2 consecutive days he did attend classes. Feed back from teachers were very positive but I have just to wait and see. I caught Mrs Strachan during 3rd period. She has been skipping 3rd & 4th for more than 12 days & teachers were skeptical what he can still make it. After talking to the two teachers involved, I were able to put him back in the 2 classes that he had missed and will have Khan Dui spend some time with him also so that I	Cleveland All day worked with Cuc Nguyen in Phu's American Government in that she can complete her assignment on time. Also tutored her in math & Science Performed supervising at both lunches	Franklin A.M 9:00 AM - 11:15 AM Peer visited title VII at ... with Kathy ... Tuesday District and making orientation ... bi-cultural staff ... to a group of 35 educators. They seemed to be very interested in what we are doing in Seattle with regards to the "Drop out" issues. My presentation lasted more than I had expected with so many questions asked by teachers and administrators. I hoped I did a good job in answering their questions & concern

59

60

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NAME: Khamchi Sikhanthat

FROM: 12 / 4 TO 12 / 15 / 89

TITLE VII MAINSTREAM SUPPORT
BI-MONTHLY DAILY-LOG REPORT.

MONDAY DATE: 12 / 4 / 89	TUESDAY DATE: 12 / 5 / 89	WEDNESDAY DATE: 12 / 6 / 89	THURSDAY DATE: 12 / 7 / 89	FRIDAY DATE: 12 / 8 / 89
At Franklin, I made a phone call to check Saengchanh Manivanh and the mother said he was sick. That's a pattern of absence. He comes to the first class and skips the second and third class and some times for the day. I discuss by phone about the consequence of absence from school with his mother.	I follow the regular schedule at Cleveland.	Mrs. Javidando asks me to contact Souriyan's parents about Psychologist test. I make a home visit immediately and meet with the father who signs the paper for the test. I know now that Souriyan is a premature boy and the father wants the psychologist test. I also make a home visit with Mr. Pham to Thong Dorossman and Manivan Saengchanh for the constant absence from school.	I follow my schedule at Cleveland but at the 4th period I was called to come to Franklin for Souriyan's case. He is tested by the school psychologist and proceed the paper. I go back to Cleveland and perform my assistance to the students by schedule.	At Franklin I was asked to bring Souriyan Saleumsay to WIAT. It is surprised me and I find out that he is suspended due to his behavior ~~the~~ toward school. I bring him to WIAT according to the vice-principal and Mr. Pham; but we are turned down due to misunderstanding the transferral procedure.

NAME: Rustico Baldoz

FROM: / TO / January 1990

TITLE VII MAINSTREAM SUPPORT
BI-MONTHLY DAILY-LOG REPORT.

MONDAY DATE: / /	TUESDAY DATE: / /	WEDNESDAY DATE: / /	THURSDAY DATE: / /	FRIDAY DATE: / /
1-17-90 Follow-up with Vice-Principal re-case of Melanie Manriquez. Pull in classes and follow the regular schedule. 1-24-90 Pull in and follow the regular schedule. Coordinated with counsellors Ms. Boden and Mr. Twine to evaluate some at-risk graduating students.	1-18-90 Contacted parents of five Filipino students for conference with Dr. Berman. This boys were engaged in a fight with American students. Set a conference. 1-25-90 Coordinated with L.A teacher regarding some Bilingual students of frequent absences. Pull in classes in Chemistry, Physical Science, Tutoring in American Gov't and U.S. II A.	1-19-20 Conference of parents and students at the office of Dr. Berman re-fight. Everything were settled and everybody back to school. Follow the day's schedule. 1-26-90 Follow the regular Schedule for both Franklin and Cleveland. Tutoring American Gov't, and U.S. II A.	1-22-90 Pull in classes in U.S II A, Physical Science, Biology. Tutoring american Gov't. Contacted parents of Cheyler Vicente re-case of no-show in some of her classes. 1-30-90 Preparation of schedules and locate whereabouts of students. Our group of two stayed in Cleveland (Seana and me). Mr. Pham and Khamoni in Franklin.	1-23-90 Coordinate with Dr. Langalin re-case of Filipino students involved in a fight. Follow the day's schedule. Tutoring in American Gov't, U.S. II A. 1-31-90 Started setting schedules and locating Students. Coordinated with Registrar, Vice-Principal regarding new BOC Students and help in changes of classes of students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO: MR. MIKE DONLIN

FROM: RUSTICO BALDOZ
Title VII Cleveland/Franklin

SUBJECT: LOG REPORT OFR THE MONTH OF FEBRUARY

Coordinated with Franklin High School Vice Principal Ms. Baldwin, Nurse, Counsellors, Teachers, and Mr. Maniego (Cheryl Maniego's father). Cheryl was unable to finished first semester and like wise to start the second. She suffered a back injury that per doctor's advise she will be out for more than six months. Ms. Baldwin asked to me to talk the parents, that we can offer in-house tutoring provided by district. The parents were very happy and I coordinated with Ms. Pizzaro of Cleveland. She was the one who took the job for two hours and a half for a week. Intervention for Anna Cote and Regalado Morales regarding absences and graduation credits. Visit Dave Santarin and talked to parents about Dave's absences and option to get a High School diploma at Middle College. At Cleveland worked the Principal re-troubles involving Filipino students. Suggested to him to put more pressure on their parents. Counselled bilingual students and tutoring most of the time one on one. Follow the regular schedule on both school. Contact parents, tutoring, pull in, pull out and counselling. Please notice most of the students mentioned were mainstream and were not even been in bilingual programs.

RECEIVED
APR 19 1990
SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSITIONAL BILINGUAL EDUCATION

MR. MIKE DONLIN

FROM: RUSTICO BALDOZ

Title VII Cleveland/Franklin

SUBJECT: REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF MARCH

Intervention re- Filipino mainstream students involved in a fight. Cooperate with security people to solve said trouble. Contacted parents of Mark Serrano regarding his frequent absences. Parents wanted Mark to be moved to other school next fall. Confer with Ms. Booker, counsellor of Franklin regarding parents request about Cheryl Vicente graduations credits. I advise the parents of Cheryl that upon evaluation of her credits her chances is very slim. Helped bilingual students to complete and filled out forms for Summer Work Traning Program. Conitnue to monitor in both school at risk-students and coordinated with Mr. Pham. Tutoring one on one, pull in and pull out, counselling and intervention were the most for this month in both school.

Also this month the mother of Wilfredo Aguilar a bilingual student at Ballard High School asked for help. Wilfredo was cited for a car accident which nobody was involved. Thorough study of his ticket I found out that itis only a traffic violation. He was driving their car when he hit a curb. I told the mother just pay the ticket, and everything will be okey. After a week the mother called me back that it is already settled, she taught before that her son would go to jail.